

UNITED STATES PATE AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITION ATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United the Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMERCE OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/676,251	09/29/2000	Joseph P. Vadala JR.	T0428/7090 TJO/RHW	3371	
75	90 06/19/2002				
Timothy J. Oyer Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C. 600 Atlantic Avenue			EXAMINER VO, HAI		
			1771	11	
		DATE MAILED: 06/19/2002			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•							
Advisory Action		Application No.	pplicant(s)				
		09/676,251	VADALA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	.	Hai Vo	1771				
The MAILING DATE of this comm	unication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 10 June 2002 FAILS Therefore, further action by the applicant is final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Network (2) a timely filed Network (3) and (3) on the compliance with 37 (4) and (4) on the compliance with 37 (4) or the compliance with	required to avo ly be either: (1) otice of Appeal	oid abandonment of this applic a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply the places the applica	y to a ition in			
<u>PE</u>	RIOD FOR REF	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)	ailing date of this Ac d for reply expire la RST REPLY WAS I	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forti ter than SIX MONTHS from the maili FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determ fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply re timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adju	nining the period of expiration date of th ceived by the Office stment. See 37 CF	extension and the corresponding am ne shortened statutory period for reply a later than three months after the ma FR 1.704(b).	ount of the fee. The appi originally set in the final ailing date of the final reje	ropriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension to	Appellant's l hereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the p 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	eriod set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will no	t be entered be	cause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would	d require furthe	r consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
Applicant's reply has overcome the formula	ollowing rejection	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s canceling the non-allowable claim(s		pe allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ★ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) application in condition for allowance	l⊠ request for r e because: <u>See</u>	econsideration has been cons Continuation Sheet	sidered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be c raised by the Examiner in the final r		use it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the propose explanation of how the new or amer	ed amendment(nded claims wo	s) a)⊡ will not be entered or t uld be rejected is provided bel	o) will be entered a ow or appended.	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will t	oe) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-33.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from considerat							
8. The proposed drawing correction file	ed on is a	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exami	iner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclo	sure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	9.	11/			
10. Other:							
			TERREL MORI SUPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT	EXAMINER			



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: what Applicant argues is not included in the claims i.e, the gate, the parting line features formed on the article are not in the claims and thus the art rejections in Paper no. 8 are sustained. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Keiser (US 5,851,617) in view of Closson (US 5,948,711) as set forth in Paper no. 4, mailed on 01/17/01. Since claim 8 depends from claim 1 which is anticipated or strongly suggested by Keiser, claim 8 is not patentable over the cited references.

TERREL MORRIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700